

# **Indiana Congregations’ Human Services Programs: A Report of a Statewide Survey**



***An initiative of the Indiana Family  
and Social Services Administration  
to assist faith-based organizations  
develop services and access funding  
to help Hoosier families in need.***

**March 7, 2001**

**Family and Social Services Administration  
State of Indiana**



**Prepared by**

**The Polis Center  
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis  
1200 Waterway Blvd., Suite 100  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202-5140  
(317) 274-2455  
Fax (317) 278-1830**

**In association with  
Crowe, Chizek and Company LLP  
3815 River Crossing Pkwy., Suite 300  
Indianapolis, IN 46240-0977  
(317) 706-2694  
FAX (317) 706-2660**

## **Indiana Congregations' Human Services Programs**

**Executive Summary.** FaithWorks Indiana was established by Governor Frank O'Bannon and the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration in 1999 to provide support to faith-based organizations that sought to become involved in the provision of human services under federal Charitable Choice legislation. The Charitable Choice legislation, part of the comprehensive welfare reforms of 1996, allows state and local government to work more closely with faith-based organizations to support their ability to provide community-based social services to families in need and to access available funding to do so. Activities of the Governor's initiative include outreach and education about Charitable Choice and FaithWorks Indiana, and technical assistance for faith-based organizations to support their ability to access available funding and to improve their ability to provide social services to families in need. The majority of funding currently available to faith-based organizations is made possible through the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) block grant. These funds support activities that promote work among vulnerable families, including job placement and training and supportive services that eliminate barriers to work.

One of the first activities of the FaithWorks Indiana initiative was to sponsor a survey of religious congregations conducted by the Polis Center in the spring of 2000, to assess congregations' capacity and interest with regard to the provision of human services and the receipt of government funds. This survey was designed, in part, to mirror the National Congregations Survey conducted by University of Arizona sociologist Mark Chaves, whose results have been presented in several publications.<sup>1</sup> These similarities allow for comparisons of Indiana findings to national findings on the same questions. Participation in human services

programs by religious congregations in the state of Indiana follows trends of participation by congregations nationally although there are some notable differences in type and degree of interest. Over three-fourths of the congregations in the Indiana survey report that they participate in human service activities of some sort, but at a rate that is higher than congregations nationally. Less than three percent of Indiana congregations use government funding to support these activities, which is similar to the national pattern. Most Indiana congregations support three or more human service-related activities and the most common programs listed are food, shelter, and emergency financial assistance. Rural, urban, and suburban congregations are equally as likely to provide human services programs. The programs most likely to qualify for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) money are among the most infrequent activities congregations offer, that is, vocational/job training, counseling, childcare, education, and some of the family planning support services, financial assistance, and shelters.

About one-third of the congregations say they have heard about FaithWorks while fifty-two percent report they are interested in applying for government funds to support their programs, if available. The proportion of congregations willing to seek government funding is highest among mainline congregations.<sup>2</sup> In addition, larger congregations are generally more willing than smaller congregations to consider applying for government funding. Contrary to some expectations, theologically conservative congregations in Indiana are more participatory and interested than those in the country as a whole. Overall, all denominations in Indiana express more interest in pursuing government support than do congregations nationally. In fact, Indiana congregations' level of interest, fifty-two percent, is significantly higher than the national level of interest, thirty-six percent, found in the National Congregations Study.

**Introduction.** Governor Frank O'Bannon launched FaithWorks Indiana in November of 1999. FaithWorks, administered by the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), provides support to faith-based organizations that are interested in the provision of human services under federal Charitable Choice legislation. Charitable Choice, Section 104 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, allows state and local government to work more closely with faith-based organizations to provide community-based social services to families in need. The provisions were part of the comprehensive welfare reforms of 1996 that led to the creation of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF); however, the provisions also apply to Welfare-to-Work funds from the U.S. Department of Labor and the Community Services Block Grant.

Implementation of Charitable Choice allowed the State of Indiana to explore new partnerships with faith-based organizations to enhance the community-based social service efforts already in place through the Family and Social Services Administration. FaithWorks Indiana's activities include outreach and education about Charitable Choice and FaithWorks Indiana, and technical assistance for faith-based organizations to support their ability to provide services to families in need and to access available funding to do so. The majority of funding currently available to faith-based organizations is made possible through the TANF block grant. These funds support activities that promote work among vulnerable families, including job placement and training and supportive services that eliminate barriers to work.

FaithWorks' early efforts have included identifying Indiana congregations that might benefit from technical assistance and government funding to advance their social service outreach. One component of this research was a survey of Indiana congregations to help staff understand the characteristics of congregations that provide human services, the types of

programs they offer, the need for technical assistance to develop services, the level of funding for these programs, congregations' receptivity to using government funds for programs they offer (if money was available), and the obstacles to participation encountered by congregations. To address these issues, FSSA contracted with The Polis Center, in conjunction with the Public Opinion Laboratory at IUPUI, to conduct a statewide telephone survey of 412 congregations in the spring of 2000.

The most significant findings from this survey are summarized in the bullet points below and elaborated throughout the presentation that follows.

- Seventy-nine percent of Indiana congregations participate in human service activities.
- Fifty-eight percent of congregations support three or more activities; the most common are food, shelter, and emergency financial assistance.
- Sixteen percent receive some kind of outside support for their programs; slightly over two percent receive government funds, and fifty-two percent expressed interest in applying for government funds, if available, to carry out activities.
- Sixty-nine percent of mainline congregations are willing to apply for government funding to support social service outreach activities compared to forty-five percent of theologically conservative congregations.
- Larger congregations tend to be more willing to consider applying for government funding for their programs.
- Sixty percent of congregations say they would spend available government funds to institute new or expand existing programming rather than spend money on non-program activities such as marketing or administration. Nonetheless, they do not rate money as important a factor as leadership in starting human service programs.
- Congregations report generally high levels of satisfaction with how well their programs are going.
- About one-third of congregations report they have heard about FaithWorks.
- Those programs most likely to receive TANF money are among the most infrequent programs congregations offer.

**Comparing Indiana with the nation.** Knowing how congregations across the U.S. participate in human services helps to put the activities of Indiana congregations in context. In order to compare the State of Indiana with national estimates, we used a subset of the survey questions originally asked in the National Congregations Study executed by Mark Chaves.<sup>3</sup> This national study covers a wide range of questions about congregational life in the U.S., with only a small proportion of the questions devoted to congregations' human service activities. We present our findings about Indiana congregations and draw comparisons throughout this report between congregations in the state and congregations nationwide.<sup>4</sup> For convenience, Table 1 highlights the significant comparisons.

**Table 1. Congregations, Human Services, and Government Funding Comparing Indiana Congregations (N=412) with National Congregations Study (N=1236)**

	% of Indiana Congregations that:	% of national Congregations that:
Participate in human services	79	57
Receive outside funds	16	11
Receive government funds	2	3
Are aware of Charitable Choice legislation	35	23
Have a policy against taking government money	16	15
Would apply for government funds if available	52	36

**Congregations' Human Service Activity.** In Indiana, 79 percent of congregations participate in human service activity of some sort. This level of participation is considerably higher than the fifty-seven percent reported by Chaves for the National Congregations Study.<sup>5</sup> Seventy-one percent of small congregations participate in some sort of human service activity while ninety-one percent of medium and ninety-seven percent of large congregations do so.<sup>6</sup> This trend of more participation in larger size congregations is consistent with national data although the Indiana participation rates are higher in all three size categories. It is noteworthy that participation by medium size congregations is higher than expected.

In comparing participation rates among denominational types, we found that there are significantly fewer theologically conservative congregations (74%) that participate in human service activity compared to their mainline (92%) and Catholic (100%) counterparts. Traditional non-mainline congregations (a category which Chaves does not use) fell in between but toward the lower end of the continuum, at seventy-nine percent.<sup>7</sup> (Theologically conservative congregations include Baptist, Pentecostal, Holiness and Evangelical congregations; mainline groups are American Baptist, Disciples of Christ, ELCA Lutheran, Episcopal, Presbyterian USA, the United Church of Christ, and the United Methodist Church. What we call traditional non-mainline groups include Wesleyan, Eastern Orthodox, Mennonite, Jewish, and Unitarian Universalist.) The majority of Indiana congregations, fifty-eight percent, participates in or sponsors three or more programs. Fourteen percent of those engaged in human service outreach have a staff person that spends at least twenty-five percent of his or her time involved in these programs. As the number of sponsored programs approaches three there is an increase in the frequency with which paid staff become involved in the congregations' programs. The mean and median numbers of adult volunteers that congregations with human service programs are able to mobilize are thirty and fifteen, respectively. For youth the averages are lower, at eleven and six, respectively. One-third of congregations' programs are run independently of other organizations.

**Funding Congregations' Human Service Activity.** Of the 412 Indiana congregations that we surveyed, seventy-nine percent sponsor some sort of human services activity. Sixteen percent of these receive funds from outside their own organization. Twelve percent of congregations with external funds receive money from government sources. Therefore, 2.4 percent of those congregations that offer programs currently receive government funding, just slightly under the



national average of 3 percent. The proportion of Indiana congregations that say they would seek government funds if they were available is higher than the national average, fifty-two percent compared to thirty-six percent in the national survey.<sup>8</sup> Again, it is important to treat these figures with caution because they represent answers about interest and willingness from congregational spokespersons (mainly pastors) and may not reflect what the congregation members would actually do or how they would express their interest if the questions had been posed to them directly. Nonetheless, as Chaves appropriately notes, if even half the number of congregations reported here receive public funds it “would represent a major change in church-state relations in the United States, and a major increase in religious congregations’ participation in our social welfare system.”<sup>9</sup>

We identified four characteristics of Indiana congregations in the bivariate, that is, crosstabulation<sup>10</sup> analysis that help determine whether a congregation is interested in applying for government funds: denomination, location, size, and racial composition of membership. Sixty-nine percent of the mainline congregations are interested in applying for government funding compared to forty-five percent of theologically conservative congregations. Differences among religious denominational groups for Indiana and the nation are reported in Table 2.

**Table 2. Mainline, Catholic, and Theologically Conservative congregations that would apply for government funding if available comparing Indiana & National Congregations Study**

	% of Indiana Congregations	% of national Congregations
Mainline congregations	69%	40%
Catholic parishes	57%	41%
Traditional non-mainline congregations	53%	N.A.
Theologically conservative congregations	45%	28%

Like denominational groups nationally, all other Indiana groups have a greater interest than do theologically conservative congregations in pursuing government funds. However, it is striking that in Indiana the level of interest ranges from seventeen to twenty-nine percent higher for each of these groups than that expressed by similar denominations nationally. Overall, the level of interest in Indiana is twenty-one percent higher than it is in the nation as a whole.

The statistical significance for the relationship between willingness to apply for government funding and denomination is complicated because there are too few Catholic parishes (N=7) with data for comparing responses to these questions. In proportion to their representation in our survey sample, there are many more mainline congregations and many fewer theologically conservative congregations that are willing to apply for government funding.<sup>11</sup> Because our sample of Catholic parishes overall for the survey is relatively low (N=10), we must treat the findings regarding Catholics guardedly. Nonetheless, our sample of Catholic congregations, 2%, compares sufficiently to the approximately 4.5% of the population of Catholic parishes in the American Church List that we think it is appropriate to include them (See Appendix A). Beyond that, Catholic congregations have been a very important source of faith-based social service delivery historically and throughout the nation such that leaving them out would give us only a partial picture.

Our analysis also indicates that larger congregations are generally more willing to apply for government funds than the small and medium size congregations. Similar analysis with respect to a congregation's location indicates that many fewer rural congregations than we would expect are likely to consider applying for government funds. Congregations without a Caucasian majority are more likely to consider applying for government funds.

In an attempt to look at all these factors together and keep our analysis as parallel as possible with the national study, we modeled four of the nine variables used by Chaves (religious tradition, size of membership, race, and location) in a logistic regression analysis.<sup>12</sup> The national survey reported that large, mainline and Catholic, urban, and predominately African-American congregations are more likely to consider applying for public funding. Our finding most in keeping with the national study is related to race, namely, that predominately African-American congregations have a much greater likelihood compared to predominately Caucasian congregations of applying for charitable choice funding. There are three differences between the Indiana patterns and the national outcomes. Unlike the national sample, two sizes of Indiana congregations, larger congregations (over 300 members) *and* congregations with between 100-160 members are somewhat more likely than small congregations (<60 members) to consider applying for government funding. Second, in Indiana, only mainline congregations (as opposed to mainline and Catholic congregations) evidence a greater than expected likelihood compared to theologically conservative congregations of applying for public funding for their social services programs. Finally, suburban congregations are one and one-half times more likely than urban congregations, and rural congregations are about three-quarters as likely as urban congregations to apply for government funding. In the national study, urban congregations are the most likely to apply.

Returning to the earlier analysis, sixteen percent of our informants indicated that their congregation had a policy against using government funds to provide social services. Nearly the same number was unsure if their congregation had such a policy. The statistical relationship between participation in human services and congregational policies against government funding was significant ( $p = 0.006$ ). Therefore, the policy against government funding may limit the

delivery of services among this group as indicated by the reduced number of congregations with such programs compared to those that had no objection to accepting government money.<sup>13</sup>

**Finances.** The greatest difference between congregational spending on human services is that between small and medium size congregations. Table 3 provides the median values for a five-percent trimmed sample, taking out the ten highest and ten lowest values in order to achieve a picture of congregations that represents the more typical case. The median amount spent per congregation in Indiana on human services matches that for the nation (\$1200).

**Table 3. Median value for amount spent on human services**

<b>Congregation Size</b>	<b>5% trimmed Median</b>	<b>(n=184)</b>
<b>small (0-150)</b>	\$975	102
<b>medium (151-500)</b>	\$2000	70
<b>large (&gt;500)</b>	\$2800	12
<b>Total</b>	\$1200	184

When we look at the amount spent by denomination in Table 4, we see that mainline congregations spend the most (\$2000) and traditional non-mainline congregations the least (\$300). Catholic parishes, which have the greatest average congregation size (see Appendix A, Table A1) spend the same amount of \$1000 per congregation as the more theologically conservative congregations which are, on average, eight times smaller. Researchers have puzzled over the differences between Protestant and Catholic giving. Several studies have agreed that an important factor is the much greater use of systematic stewardship programs in Protestant congregations than in Catholic parishes.<sup>14</sup> Another interesting difference that comes to light in our survey is that between theologically conservative and mainline congregations' spending for human service activities. Research at the national level has shown that total giving among theologically conservative congregations is higher than among either mainline or Catholic congregations.<sup>15</sup> Despite this, our survey may suggest that in Indiana, theologically

conservative congregations are less willing than mainline Protestant congregations to spend their collections on social service related activities.

**Table 4. Average amount of money spent per congregation, by denomination, on human services**

<b>Denomination</b>	<b>5% trimmed Median</b>	<b>(n=184)</b>
<b>Traditional non-mainline</b>	\$300	12
<b>Theologically Conservative</b>	\$1000	107
<b>Catholic</b>	\$1000	6
<b>Mainline Protestant</b>	\$2000	59
<b>Totals</b>	\$1200	184

**Congregations with programs versus those that do not.** A common assumption is that many of the congregations that provide human services are located in urban areas. Our survey data show that congregations that currently participate in social services, community development or some other form of neighborhood programming are no more likely to come from an urban, suburban, or rural location than congregations that do not provide these services.

When we compare the average size of congregations that participate in human services with those that do not, we find a significant difference between these two groups ( $p=0.0005$ ). In general, the size of those congregations that participate in some sort of social service or outreach activity is double those that do not. Using median membership size we found 150 members in the former and 80 members in the latter.<sup>16</sup>

**What kinds of programs do congregations participate in?** Informants described 300 different program activities, which we collapsed into 19 general categories (see Table 5). Consistent with the national study, providing food-related services, whether in a soup kitchen, food bank, food basket, and the like, is the most frequent type of social service activity congregations engage in, (28 percent did so). The second most common activity is related to evangelizing, which we removed from the analysis. Evangelizing is outside the scope of the survey and of FaithWorks

due to the prohibition against using government funds for inherently religious activities, such as worship and proselytization. While some congregations see these events as social service programs, we considered activities such as assisting other congregations, building congregations, busing poor children to services, supporting missionaries, giving Bible studies, and doing prison ministry as evangelizing.<sup>17</sup>

<b>Program Type</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent of Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Cases</b>	<b>Percent of all Churches</b>
Food	206	28.5	66	44
Shelter (day/overnight/transitional housing) *	59	8.2	19	13
Building houses/redevelopment	57	7.9	18	13
Other	57	7.9	18	13
Financial assistance *	44	6.1	14	10
Clothing	43	6	14	10
Support business/community/nhood associations	41	5.7	13	7
Fundraising	33	4.6	11	7
Family planning support services	31	4.3	10	7
Legal/medical/mental health services	30	4.2	10	7
Mentoring/Tutoring/Education *	27	3.7	9	7
Child care * /foster care	23	3.2	7	6
Counseling (substance abuse/domestic violence/standard) *	23	3.2	7	5
Youth recreation	13	1.8	4	3
Vocational/job training *	11	1.5	3	3
Refugee support/National disaster relief	9	1.2	3	2
Senior services	9	1.2	3	2
Use of Space	6	0.8	2	1
Total responses	722	100	232	160

\* These categories contain programs that could potentially receive TANF monies<sup>18</sup>

The next most commonly offered services are for shelter and building houses/redevelopment (about 8 percent each). These findings align with Chaves' where the top two responses were food and shelter. However, in contrast to Chaves, we differentiated shelter and building houses because the former is often an emergency activity and provides a short-term solution to homelessness. The latter is the type of service that addresses the longer-term housing

needs of individuals who are currently homeless. This type of activity requires greater planning and more volunteers, which are frequently found in the larger congregations.

Skipping over the myriad "other" responses,<sup>19</sup> the next three most frequently provided services are offering financial assistance (usually rent and utility money), clothing, and supporting local business, community and neighborhood associations (approximately six percent each). If we were to collapse the last item on our list, the use of congregation space (most often by boy scout and girl scout troops), into the category of support neighborhood associations, then it would push this response above the other two. The remainder of the provided services each make up less than five percent of the total programs congregations offer, although collectively they total thirty percent of the human service activity of congregations. These include fundraising, family planning support services, programs for seniors, legal and medical services, tutoring, youth recreation, vocational/job training, national disaster relief, and, as already mentioned, sharing congregational space.

Many programs of interest to government funders are programs related to the support of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). The categories that contain congregational programs that might possibly receive TANF money include vocational/job training, counseling, childcare, education, some of the family planning assistance programs, financial assistance and shelters (see asterisks in Table 5). We identified 23 such programs among the congregations surveyed (3% of all programs) that might use TANF dollars, though the number could be twice this amount. We would need additional research into these congregations' programs and the congregations' characteristics to draw definitive conclusions. An interesting finding here is that those programs most likely to receive TANF money are the least frequently offered programs by congregations. We found that among shelter programs and financial assistance, there were only

a small number of services mentioned by the congregations that would qualify for TANF grants. We do not know why congregations do not offer these services more frequently. But this is consistent with the national finding that “congregations are more likely to engage in addressing the immediate needs of individuals for food, clothing, and shelter than in projects or programs that require sustained involvement to meet longer-term goals.”<sup>20</sup>

When congregations offer programs they usually offer more than one. Within each size category the most typical congregation offering is three or more programs. Small congregations had the highest reported frequency of programs, followed by medium size congregations. Taken together they engage in over ninety percent of all congregational programming. This is expected since small and medium congregations together constitute ninety-four percent of the sample. Another way to look at the location of programs is to see whether they are offered as single programs by congregations or grouped as multiple programs. Of the 722 programs named by congregations, 73 percent are in congregations that offer 3 or more programs, 16 percent in congregations that offer 2 programs and 11 percent in congregations that offer a single program.<sup>21</sup> In looking at programs that cluster into three or more, we found that forty-nine percent of small congregations offer three or more programs, compared to sixty-nine percent of medium congregations and sixty-two percent of large congregations. Adding in congregations that offer two programs, the medium size congregations contain the largest proportion of two or more program clusters.

The size of a congregation is also related to the kinds of programs offered. Because small size congregations are the greatest proportion of congregations in the U.S. as a whole, as well as in the state of Indiana, it is important for strategic reasons in social service planning, delivery, and evaluation to pay close attention to them. Small congregations offer the most



programs. This is because small congregations make up the majority of congregations *and* because over two-thirds of the small congregations offer more than one program. Over half of each of the following programs are found in small congregations with fewer than 150 members: food, shelter, financial assistance, clothing, fundraising, mentoring/ tutoring/ education, youth recreation, vocational/job training, and national disaster relief.<sup>22</sup> Among all but one of the remaining types of programs, at least fifty percent of the programs in each category are offered in a medium size congregation. These programs include building houses, family planning support services, legal/medical/mental health services, child/foster care, counseling, senior services, and use of physical space. Small and medium size congregations are about evenly split in their support of local associations. Large congregations do not predominate in any of these areas.

Most people presume that social service outreach is greater in urban areas than elsewhere because this is where the greatest concentration of people is, including the poor. However, the U.S. Bureau of the Census reports that nationally the poverty rate is higher in rural areas (16.8%) than in cities (13.9%).<sup>23</sup> We found the greatest proportion (42%) of each type of program among congregations that identified themselves as being located in a rural area in Indiana. (See Appendix A for description of location.) The suburban and urban congregations have very similar but smaller proportions (27% and 31% respectively) of the congregations' human service programs. There are some differences, however, between the types of programs found in each of these locations. The programs offered more frequently in urban congregations include legal, medical and mental health services. Childcare, counseling and providing use of physical space are most frequent in suburban locations.

There are differences among denominations regarding the types of human service programs they sponsor. Theologically conservative congregations are more likely than Catholic parishes, 1.5 times more likely than mainline congregations, and twice as likely as traditional non-mainline congregations to offer independently run programs. Catholic parishes are 1.5 to 4 times more likely than mainline, traditional non-mainline or theologically conservative congregations to engage in programs that provide food and clothing, as well as legal/medical and senior services. Theologically conservative congregations are more likely than the others to provide counseling and tutoring. They are also about as likely as mainline congregations to provide financial assistance and both of these denominations are more likely than traditional non-mainline congregations or Catholic parishes to do so. Traditional non-mainline congregations are more likely than the other three denominational groups to provide temporary shelter, national disaster relief, support to community associations, and to do fundraising. Traditional non-mainline congregations are equally as likely as theologically conservative congregations to provide youth recreation and both denominational groups are more likely than mainline congregations or Catholic parishes to do this sort of outreach. Mainline congregations are more likely than the other three groups to provide childcare programs, engage in building permanent housing and to share the use of their space. Particularly noteworthy is that the one program where all the denominations were nearly equally likely to engage was in the area of family planning support services.

**Congregations' attitudes towards human services.** Twenty-one percent of the congregations report they do not participate in any form of social service outreach. We analyzed the pre-coded and open-ended answers to the question "What are some of the reasons why your congregation does not participate in these kinds of programs?" The reasons vary--from theological objections

to lack of finances to their perception that there is no need for this type of public involvement. But the most common response, from almost half of those not participating, is the pre-coded answer, “lack of time, energy, and volunteers.” Theologically conservative congregations are the only group to cite theological reasons. Mainline congregations are more likely than others to cite lack of finances and lack of time, energy, and volunteers. Small congregations are much more likely than larger congregations to cite lack of time, energy, and volunteers.

Less than two percent of congregations participating in human service activities are dissatisfied with how well their program is going. Over forty percent report they are very satisfied; this is not related to how many programs they participate in or to the size of their membership. We did notice, however, that urban congregations tend to be a little less satisfied compared to congregations in other environments (rural, suburban, or mixed).

We asked the congregations to report on the kinds of problems they were having in carrying out their activities. The most frequent response is difficulty in recruiting volunteers. The second most frequent response is congregations reporting “no problem.” The third most frequent response is difficulty in obtaining funding. A different way to understand potential obstacles for congregations in their efforts to start a human service program is to rate the importance of several key factors. It is noteworthy that from among the five factors we asked congregations to rate--leadership, religious beliefs, money, volunteers, and community needs--money ranked lowest in importance. The highest rated factor is leadership.

**Uses of government money.** If congregations had government money, what would they do differently? Sixty percent of congregations report they would focus on programming activities. While about 25 percent report they would “do more” without specifying any program activity in

particular, more named a charitable, youth, or development, support, or training activity (37%). Almost twelve percent report they would do nothing differently.

The category of development/support/training is most closely connected to the kinds of programs funded by TANF and it is noteworthy that almost ten percent of congregations report they would concentrate in this category. Among the denominational types, theologically conservative congregations are the least likely to “do more” in this category compared to the other groups.

## **APPENDIX A: The Indiana Sample**

**Sampling Frame.** The Public Opinion Laboratory of IUPUI conducted a 12-minute telephone survey with the pastor, rabbi, or other leader of 412 religious congregations selected randomly from throughout the State of Indiana. A sample of 2880 congregations, stratified by size and oversampled for small and medium congregations, was drawn from the American Church List for the state of Indiana (N=9226). We were not able to stratify by race as those data were not available. We had valid telephone numbers for 2400 congregations and were able to contact via telephone 561 congregations; we completed surveys in 412. Thus, while our response rate (completed surveys/telephone numbers available) was not high, 17 percent, our *cooperation rate*, (responses from those congregations who actually answered their phones), was 73 percent. The cooperation rate is calculated based on 412 completed surveys divided by the completed calls plus breakoffs and refusals ( $412 / (412 + 18 + 131) = 412/561 = 73\%$ ). Standard telephone survey protocol is to make ten attempts to reach respondents before selecting a new sample member. Many small congregations do not have regular staff to answer phones. We believe our relatively low response rate is due to the difficulty in reaching sample members within the timeframe for conducting this survey. Nonetheless, comparing characteristics of our sample with the national sample, as well as with the Indiana population on particular items, we are reasonably confident that the survey sample is representative of the population of congregations in the state of Indiana.

**Characteristics of the sample.** Chaves suggests that his finding of 57 percent participation in human service activity is lower than earlier studies that reported between 92 percent and 95 percent participation rates because these other surveys had oversampled large congregations.

**Table A0a. Congregational Size for Indiana and National Congregations Survey**

	Indiana	NCS*
Fewer than or equal to 150	59%	70%
151 – 500	34%	24%
Greater than 500	6%	6%
Median =	125	75

\*The NCS figures are approximate based on Table 4 in Chaves, 1999a.

More than half (59 %) of our sample is of congregations with memberships fewer than 150, 34 percent have a membership between 151 and 500, and only 6 percent falls into the group of congregations greater than 500 (See Table A0a). Our overall median of 125 members is somewhat higher than the national median of 75.<sup>24</sup> About 44 percent of Indiana congregations have 100 members or fewer and about 17 percent have 50 or fewer members. The National Congregations Survey reports about 60 percent with 100 or fewer and about 40 percent with 55 or fewer. Lacking an on-the-ground count of congregations in Indiana, it is possible that the American Church List may undercount the small congregations. Since congregation lists have usually been estimated to undercount smaller congregations between a factor of 10 to 30 percent, it is possible our sample is also short on small congregations, though we feel we have oversampled small congregations to a greater extent than previous surveys. Our sample is not biased in the direction of large size congregations and our medium size congregation group is about 10 percent higher than the national group. Having a larger than expected number of medium size congregations in Indiana may actually reflect some regional variation.

Compared to the country as a whole the state of Indiana contains a larger rural population, somewhat more theologically conservative denominations, and fewer large urban centers. Overall, our final sample matched these characteristics. Forty-five percent of the congregations are located in rural areas, twenty-eight percent in urban areas, twenty-four percent in suburban areas and three percent in environmentally-mixed areas. We identified 33

denominations among the 412 congregations and collapsed them into 4 general categories: mainline, traditional non-mainline, fundamental/evangelical/Pentecostal (theologically conservative or FEP), and Catholic.<sup>25</sup> Using this typology for assessing denomination we found that 65 percent of Indiana congregations we surveyed are comprised of fundamental/evangelical/Pentecostal congregations, 26 percent are mainline congregations, 6 percent are traditional non-mainline and 2 percent are Catholic parishes (See Table A0b on the following page). We have provided a comparison to the national congregation counts reported in the National Congregations Survey.

<b>Table A0b. Denominational Families of Indiana Congregations by FSSA Survey and NCS</b>		
	FSSA Survey	NCS*
<b><i>Theologically Conservative denominations</i></b> include: Adventist, Apostolic, Assembly of God, Baptist, Brethren, Church of Christ (Christian), Church of Nazarene, Evangelical, Holiness, Independent, Independent Christian, Inter-denominational, Methodist, Missouri Synod Lutheran, Southern Baptist	65% (N=269)	62% (N=766)
<b><i>Mainline Denominations:</i></b> American Baptist, Episcopalian, Disciples of Christ, ELCA Lutheran, Presbyterian USA, United Methodist, United Church of Christ	27% (N=109)	24% (N=297)
<b><i>Traditional Non-Mainline Denominations</i></b> include: Eastern Orthodox, Jewish, Mennonite, Unitarian-Universalist, Wesleyan	6% (N=24)	8% (N=99)
<b><i>Roman Catholic</i></b>	2% (N=10)	6% (N=74)
Total	100% (N=412)	100% (N=1236)
*This is based on our grouping of denominational affiliations reported in Chaves, et al, 1999a		

Most of the congregations in our sample have Caucasian majorities. Ninety-five percent (N=389) of the congregations are predominately Caucasian, slightly less than three percent (N=12) are predominately African-American, slightly over one percent (N=5) have no racial or ethnic predominance, and less than one percent are predominately Hispanic or Asian (N=2).

The size of these Indiana congregations range from 8 to 1,920 members (see Table A1). The mean membership size is 207, and the median is 125 individuals. The greatest number of congregations in our sample is found among the theologically conservative and mainline congregations, followed by traditional non-mainline and Catholic congregations. Theologically conservative congregations range from 13 to 1,920 members--our largest single congregation--with a mean of 178 and median of 115. Mainline congregations range in size from 25 to 1,560 members with a mean of 248 and median of 185. Traditional non-mainline congregations range from 8 to 372 members, with a mean of 114, and a median of 88 members. Catholic parishes range from 125 to 1,500 members, with a mean of 751 members, and a median of 800 members.

**Table A1. Descriptive statistics for congregation members by denomination**

MEMBERS					
DENOMINATION	N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
FEP	265	178	115	13	1920
Mainline	109	248	185	25	1560
Traditional	24	114	88	8	372
Catholic	10	751	800	125	1500
Total	408	207	125	8	1920

Mainline congregations are equally as likely as Catholic parishes to be significantly different from traditional non-mainline and theologically conservative congregations with regard to the mean size of membership. Interestingly, there are no large (over 500 member) traditional non-mainline congregations and only one small (less than 150 member) Catholic parish (see Table A2).



Table A2. Median Membership Size by Denominational Type

MEMBERS								
DENOMINATION	CHURCH SIZE							
	small (0-150)		medium (151-500)		large (>500)		Total	
	Grouped Median	N	Grouped Median	N	Grouped Median	N	Grouped Median	N
FEP	76	168	216	81	735	16	116	265
Mainline	96	50	266	52	1200	7	185	109
Traditional	63	20	282	4			84	24
Catholic	125	1	250	2	840	7	800	10
Total	79	239	248	139	800	30	125	408

Overall, for our entire sample the theologically conservative (FEP) congregations constitute the greatest number of congregations in each size category, followed by mainline congregations. Because we feel that median values more accurately represent congregation data, we report in Table A2 the grouped median value for each of the congregation sizes by denomination.

**APPENDIX B: The Questionnaire**

**SURVEY OF INDIANA CONGREGATIONS'  
HUMAN SERVICE PROGRAMS**

- 1a. Has your congregation participated in or supported social service, community development, or neighborhood organizing projects of any sort within the past 12 months? Please *don't* include projects that use or rent space in your building but have no other connection to your congregation.  
Yes .....(Skip to Q. 2a) ..... 1  
No ..... 2
- 1b. What are some of the reasons why your congregation does not participate in these kinds of programs?  
Theological\_\_\_\_\_ (Skip to Q.12) . . 1  
Financial\_\_\_\_\_ (Skip to Q.10a) . . 2  
Lack of time, energy, people\_\_\_\_\_ (Skip to Q.10a) . . 3  
Other\_\_\_\_\_ (Skip to Q.10a) . . 4
- 2a. What projects or programs have you sponsored or participated in?
- 2b. For each of these, please tell me whether it is a program or project completely run by your congregation, or whether it is a program that is run by or in collaboration with other groups or organizations.
- 2c. ASK ONLY ABOUT PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT PROGRAMS OF JUST THIS CONGREGATION:  
  
With what other organizations does your congregation collaborate on this program?
3. How much money, overall, did your congregation directly receive on all of these projects or programs within the past 12 months? Here I'm asking about direct cash donations from your congregation, not counting staff time or volunteer time.  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_
- 4a. Within the past 12 months, has anyone who is paid by your congregation spent more than 25% of their work time on one or more of these projects?  
Yes ..... 1  
No .....(Skip to Q.5a) ..... 2

4b. How many of your paid staff spent more than 25% of their work time on one or more of these projects?  
\_\_\_\_\_

5a. Has anyone from your congregation done any volunteer work for one or more of these programs within the past 12 months?

Yes ..... 1

No .....(Skip to Q.6). ..... 2

5b. Of the regularly participating adults in your congregation, how many of them would you say did volunteer work at least once for one or more of these programs within the past 12 months? \_\_\_\_\_

5c. Of the regularly participating youth in your congregation, how many of them would you say did volunteer work at least once for one or more of these programs within the past 12 months? \_\_\_\_\_

6. How satisfied are you overall with how well your program(s) is/are going?

Very satisfied ..... 1

Somewhat satisfied ..... 2

Not satisfied at all ..... 3

7. What have been some of the problems that you have had in carrying out your program(s)?  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. For each of the factors I will mention, please tell me how important it is for starting a congregational human services program. Please use a scale of 1 to 5 with '1' being least important and '5' being most important.

	Least important			Most important	
Someone willing to take leadership	1	2	3	4	5
Religious beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
Money	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of help from others	1	2	3	4	5
Community Needs	1	2	3	4	5

#### SECTION ON FUNDING

9a. Are any of the programs you've mentioned supported by outside funds directly provided to your congregation by other agencies or organizations?

Yes ..... 1

No .....(Skip to Q.10a).. ..... 2

9b. Did any of these funds come as donations from foundations, businesses, or the United Way?

Yes ..... 1  
No .....(Skip to Q.9d) ..... 2

9c. How much did your congregation receive from foundations, businesses, or the United Way in your most recent fiscal year?

\_\_\_\_\_

9d. Did any of these funds come from local, state, or federal government?

Yes ..... 1  
No .....(Skip to Q.10a) ..... 2

9e. How much money did your congregation receive from the government in grants, contracts, or fees during your most recent fiscal year?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_  
(Skip to Q.12)

10a. Have you heard about recently passed federal legislation that would enable religious congregations to apply for public money to support their human services programs?

Yes ..... 1  
No ..... 2

10b. Does your congregation have a policy against receiving funds from local, state, or federal government?

Yes .... (Skip to Q. 12) ..... 1  
No ..... 2

10c. Do you think your congregation would apply for government money to support human services programs if it was available?

Yes ..... 1  
No ..... 2

11. If you had government money right now to support human services programs, what is the most important thing you would do differently?

\_\_\_\_\_

12. Have you heard about FaithWorks, an initiative by the State of Indiana, to inform faith-based organizations and assist them in applying for public money to support their human services programs?

Yes ..... 1  
No. .... 2

Now I would like to ask you just a few descriptive questions about your congregation.

13a. (IF DENOMINATION IS APPARENT FROM THE NAME, FILL IN  
HERE: \_\_\_\_\_)

(Skip to Q. 14)

13b. Is your congregation a member of a denomination, or is it nondenominational?  
Nondenominational. . . . . 1

13c. If respondent says denomination, ask what denomination is that?  
Denomination name: \_\_\_\_\_ 2

14. How many people do you consider to be members of your congregation?  
IF RESPONDENT ASKS IF CHILDREN ARE INCLUDED, SAY HOWEVER YOU  
COUNT THEM IN YOUR MEMBERSHIP.  
IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY COUNT ONLY FAMILIES, ASK FOR THE  
NUMBER OF FAMILIES.

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS -  
Adults only . . . . . 1  
Adults and children . . . 2

FAMILIES

15. What is the racial and ethnic composition of your membership? That is, what percent  
of your membership falls into each of these groups? [READ TO RESPONDENT]  
\_\_\_\_\_ % African-American/Black  
\_\_\_\_\_ % Caucasian/White  
\_\_\_\_\_ % Hispanic/Latino/a  
which ethnic groups? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ % Asian/Pacific Islander  
which ethnic groups? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ % Other  
which? \_\_\_\_\_

16. Is your congregation located in an urban, suburban, or rural location?  
Urban . . . . . 1  
Suburban. . . . . 2  
Rural. . . . . 3  
Other/mixed [ONLY IF RESPONDENT VOLUNTEERS] . . 4

<sup>1</sup> Chaves, Mark. et al. 1999a, "The National Congregations Study: Background, Methods, and Selected Results" *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 38: 458-476; 1999b, "Congregations and Welfare Reform: Who Will Take Advantage of 'Charitable Choice?'" *American Sociological Review* 64 (6): 836-846. 1999c, "Congregations' Social Service Activities" *The Urban Institute* Brief No. 6, December 1999.

<sup>2</sup> **Mainline congregations** are American Protestant congregations in the following seven denominations: American Baptist, Disciples of Christ, ELCA Lutheran, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, United Church of Christ, and United Methodist.

<sup>3</sup> See Chaves, 1999b, "Congregations and Welfare Reform" and Appendix B.

<sup>4</sup> This study was undertaken by The Polis Center – IUPUI, under contract with FSSA to provide research services to Crowe, Chizek and Company LLP, project managers for FaithWorks.

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix A for discussion of sample characteristics and sampling frame as related to participation.

<sup>6</sup> Small congregations range between 1-150 members, medium size congregations range between 151 and 500 members, and large congregations have over 500 members. Refer to Appendix A for a discussion of the median values for these categories.

<sup>7</sup> **Mainline congregations** are American Protestant congregations in the following seven denominations: American Baptist, Disciples of Christ, ELCA Lutheran, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, United Church of Christ, and United Methodist; **traditional non-mainline congregations** include Jewish, Mennonite, Orthodox, Quaker, Unitarian/Universalist and Wesleyan; **theologically conservative congregations** include Adventist, Apostolic, Assembly of God, Baptist, Brethren, Church of Christ/Christian, Church of God, Church of Nazarene, Evangelical, Holiness, Methodist, Missionary, Missouri Synod Lutheran, Non-Denominational, Pentecostal, Southern Baptist, Independent, Independent Christian, and Inter-denominational; and **Catholics** include only Roman Catholic parishes.

<sup>8</sup> The key survey item was, "Do you think your congregation would apply for government money to support your human services programs if it was available?" Informants also were asked, "Does your congregation have a policy against receiving funds from local, state, or federal government?" Those answering "yes" to this question were coded "no" on the "Do you think your congregation would apply . . ." item. Congregations currently receiving government funds were coded "yes" on the "Do you think. . . ." item. Chaves, 1999b, fn 3.

<sup>9</sup> Chaves, 1999b, p. 838.

<sup>10</sup> Three kinds of statistical comparisons are used in this report. *Univariate* statistics are those that report the range of responses for any single measure, that is, the answers to a single survey question. "Crosstabulation" or *bivariate* statistics compare answers to two survey questions within the categories of each answer to signal whether there is any statistical relationship between them. *Multivariate* statistics, such as reported on p. 9, refers to a statistical procedure in which the answers to several questions are compared simultaneously in order to identify which item is the most influential vis-à-vis the others.

<sup>11</sup> When we remove Catholic congregations from the analysis (so that we do not violate the assumptions of the Chi Square statistic, in this case having fewer than 20% of our cells with expected values less than 5), the results are significant for the remaining 3 denominational groups.

<sup>12</sup> Because our survey was limited to questions about human service activities, we did not ask all the questions that were part of the National Congregations Study. We could not evaluate exposure to secular institutional environments, percentage of a congregation's membership that is poor, the distance people walk to services, or whether the institutions were theologically and politically conservative.

<sup>13</sup> Forty-one of sixty-six congregations with a policy against accepting government funds offered social service programs. If there were no relationship between these two variables we would expect as many as fifty of these congregations to offer programs.

<sup>14</sup> Joseph Claude Harris, "U.S. Catholic contributions—Up or down?" *America*, 21 May 1994, 170:18 p.14; Dean R. Hoge, et al, *Money matters: personal giving in American congregations*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996. Robert Wuthnow, *God and Mammon in America*. New York: Free Press, 1994, p. 229. Nonetheless, some church leaders have argued that lower Catholic contributions to parishes may be related to Catholic giving to national denominational programs and other Catholic church affiliated organizations. Personal conversation with Tom Gaybrick, Director, Catholic Charities Archdiocese of Indianapolis, November, 2000.

<sup>15</sup> According to Hoge, et al., conservative Protestants give more than 3 percent of household income on average; black Protestants 2.5 percent; mainline Protestants, 2 percent; Catholics, less than 1.5 percent; and other

denominations, less than 1 percent. See also McCord, Julia, "Churches Lagging in Collections" *Omaha World-Herald*, 23 April 2000.

<sup>16</sup> This relationship is maintained when the comparison is run using the natural log of membership size to compare these two groups. The log values for membership size normalizes this distribution (and eta rose from .226 to .312).

<sup>17</sup> There were 118 evangelical outreach programs, or 14% of the total program responses.

<sup>18</sup> A wide variety of services are technically eligible to receive TANF funding. The State of Indiana's use of TANF funding for direct support of faith-based organizations currently is focused primarily on services to promote self-sufficiency, services for non-custodial parents, and youth services. Other assistance, like food vouchers and other basic needs assistance, may be technically eligible for TANF funding; however, these types of assistance may trigger additional TANF policies like time limits and pose administrative burdens that outside providers would not be equipped to address.

<sup>19</sup> Examples in this group include sponsored a city dumpster, help the needy--general social services, gifts to inmates families, provide school supplies, support to minorities via NAACP, help with furniture or home repairs and maintenance.

<sup>20</sup> Chaves, 1999c, p. 2.

<sup>21</sup> What we do not know is how the size of the population served is related to congregation membership size. This will require additional research.

<sup>22</sup> These programs are listed in descending order of their frequency.

<sup>23</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1995. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office cited in David M. Newman, 1997, *Sociology: Exploring the Architecture of Everyday Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

<sup>24</sup> Our median is calculated on reported raw congregational membership numbers as opposed to the national study which uses a probability-proportional-to-size method to weight congregations inversely proportional to their congregational size giving each congregation equal weight to undo the overrepresentation of large congregations.

<sup>25</sup> Refer to Endnote 7.